REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in this application, with claims 1, 9 and 14 being amended by this response. Specifically, claims 1, 9 and 14 have been amended for clarification purposes only. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and more specifically on Page 8, line 9 to Page 9, line 29. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liwerant et al. (US 2005/0246752).

The present invention provides a method and apparatus for sharing information in a network. A user is enabled to define a data segment. The defined data segment is then recorded at a first of a plurality of user systems connected to the network. First information is then transmitted, identifying the recorded data segment, to a remote location. The first information is data other than the recorded data segment. The transmission precludes the transmission of the recorded data. Second information identifying the defined data segment within the recorded data segment is then received by the first of the plurality of user systems from a second of the plurality of user systems via the remote location. The second information is data other than the recorded data segment. The transmission precludes the transmission of the recorded data. The second information identifies the defined data segment within the recorded data segment located at the first user system connected to the network, and being other than the recorded data segment is then received from the remote location. Independent claims 1, 9 and 14 include features similar to those discussed above and thus all arguments presented herein below apply to each of these claims..

"As the use of PVRs increases and the cost of solid state memory decreases, the quantity of recorded data among PVR users will likely increase. As this quantity of recorded data accumulates, it becomes more difficult for PVR users to decide what data may be of interest to them, thereby requiring the users to spend valuable time sorting through hours of

recorded data [on their own PVRs]. Accordingly there is a need for a system which helps users save time in identifying recorded data that may be of interest to them" (Page 1, lines 24-30). Additionally, when a user wants to share video data segments of interest a user must "record a given data segment, and send the recorded data segment to other users via, for example, the internet" (Page 2, lines 1-2). However, this method is problematic in many respects. Firstly, "a large amount of bandwidth is required to send certain types of data segments, such as video data segments" (Page 2, lines 3-5). Another exists at the receiver, when receiving multiple video data segments the receiver "must utilize valuable memory resources in order to store the received segments" (Page 2, line 6). Additionally, the transmissions in themselves are problematic in terms of copyrighted material. Specifically, it may be legal to record copyrighted materials for personal use but not to transmit to others.

In response to these problems, the present claimed invention seeks to provide a "peer-to-peer network in which data segments such as video data segments may be recorded by individual users, and information associated with the recorded data segments, such as metadata, may be shared with other users within the network" (Page 3, lines 11-14). The present claimed invention solves the problems of the common systems by sharing the information identifying the data recorded with other user systems. The other users are then enabled to identify portions of interest within the data recorded at the first user location so that the first user can navigate through their own recorded data to view portions of interest. The present claimed invention also reduces the amount of data sent through the network. "In particular, the information associated with a given recorded data segment defines certain parameters of the segment, such as its starting point and ending point, but does not constitute the segment itself. Accordingly, bandwidth on the network 60 and memory capacity of the server 50 are conserved since the transmitted information associated with the recorded data segments is much less voluminous than the data segments themselves" (Page 4, lines 11-16).

In an exemplary embodiment a user defines and records a data segment at a first location connected to the network. Data representing the recorded defined segment is then added to a highlight guide available at all locations in the network. In this way, all the systems connected to the network are aware of the recorded data located at the first location. The other systems connected to the network can then modify the data representing the

recorded defined segment at the first location to indicate their own areas of interest related to that recorded data segment (Page 8, line 17 – Page 9, line 29).

Liwerant et al. describe a system for sharing video segments over a network. The video input device may be a web camera, computer or VCR (paragraph 0010). A **video segment** can be automatically uploaded onto a **server** (paragraph 005). The video data is stored on the server or remotely and can be streamed over a network to a receiving computer (paragraph 005). The video data can be "accessed by any number of viewers...[using] an identifier of the video" (paragraph 0006).

The Office Action asserts that Liwerant et al. disclose transmitting information identifying the recorded data segment and **not** the recorded data segment. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Liwerant et al. allow a user to create a video segment using a webcam and record it at a user system that is connected to the network ([0040]). A thumbnail is then created "by taking the "middle" image of the entire video file" ([0085]). The saved video data and the "thumbnail" are then uploaded onto the server ([0086]). This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which uploads first information identifying the recorded data segment but precludes the transmission of the recorded data itself. Thus, Liwerant et al. are fundamentally different than the present claimed invention, as Liwerant et al. **send both** the thumbnail and the video segment itself and the present claimed invention sends the first information identifying the recorded information **but precludes the transmission of the recorded information itself**. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Liwerant et al. neither disclose nor suggest "transmitting first information identifying the recorded data segment to a remote location, said first information being data other than the recorded data segment and said transmission precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1, 9 and 14 of the present claimed invention.

Additionally, Liwerant et al. are not concerned with receiving second information from a second user at a second location the second information defining a data segment within the data segment recorded at the first user location. Specifically, Liwerant et al. are concerned with transmitting a data segment and a thumbnail to a server and then, upon request, transmitting the data segment to a second user at a second location. The second user

in Liwerant et al. requests information stored on the server. The second user is not concerned with a data segment recorded at a first user location. Additionally, the first user does not receive information from the second user identifying portions of the data segment to the first user. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which is concerned with receving second information from a second user indicating portions of interest within the data segment recorded at the first user system connected to the network. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Liwerant et al. neither disclose nor suggest "receiving, at the first of the plurality of user systems, from a second of plurality of user systems via the remote location, at each of the plurality of user systems connected to the network, second information identifying the said defined data segment within said recorded data segment located at said first user system connected to the network, said second information being data other than the recorded data segment and precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1of the present claimed invention.

The Office Action asserts further that Liwerant et al. disclose receiving second information as recited in the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as described above, Liwerant et al. are merely concerned with a second user receiving the uploaded data segment after sending a request to the server. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, in which a first location receives data defining a segment of interest within a data segment already recorded at its location. Thus, the present claimed invention is fundamentally different than Liwerant et al., as Liwerant et al. **receive a data segment** and the present claimed invention **receives only the data indicating portions of interest** within the recorded data segment. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Liwerant et al. neither disclose nor suggest "receiving, at the first of the plurality of user systems, from a second of plurality of user systems via the remote location, at each of the plurality of user systems connected to the network, second information identifying the said defined data segment within said recorded data segment located at said first user system connected to the network, said second information being data other than the recorded data segment and precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1of the present claimed invention.

As claims 9 and 14 include similar features to those of claim 1 discussed above, all arguments apply to each of these claims As claims 2-6, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 15-17 are each dependent on one of Independent claims 1, 9 and 14 it is respectfully submitted these claims are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above regarding the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 14.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Liwerant et al. showing the above discussed features of independent claims 1, 9 and 14. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 are not anticipated by Liwerant et al. It is thus respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7, 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 7, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liwerant et al. in view of Moynihan (US 2002/0056119 A1).

Moynihan describes a method and system for transferring multimedia files to a central server where the files can be readily accessed by other users on the network. Moynihan provides a way for users on a network to organize, edit, index, host and display multimedia files on a central server, while preserving control over how and to whom the files are displayed. Once the multimedia is published, integrated tools to manage, publicize, edit, charge for and control access to the multimedia are provided.

The Office Action asserts that Moynihan discloses transmitting data in accordance with a predefined time schedule. However, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., is not concerned with transmitting **only** first information identifying the recorded data segment. More importantly, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., describe the very problem addressed by the present claimed invention, as Moynihan describe uploading the video data onto a central server. This requires a large amount of bandwidth and is contrary to the object of the present claimed invention, which minimizes the bandwidth required to share information regarding data segments of interest, such as television program highlights.

Therefore, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., neither discloses nor suggests "transmitting first information identifying the recorded data segment to a remote location, said first information being data other than the recorded data segment and said transmission precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Additionally, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al,. are not concerned with receiving second information from a second user at a second location the second information defining a data segment within the data segment recorded at the first user location. Specifically, Moynihan is concerned with transmitting a data segment and a thumbnail to a server and then, upon request, transmitting the data segment to a second user at a second location. The second user in Moynihan et al. requests information stored on the server. The second user is not concerned with a data segment recorded at a first user location. Additionally, the first user does not receive information from the second user identifying portions of the data segment to the first user. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which is concerned with receiving second information from a second user indicating portions of interest within the data segment recorded at the first user system connected to the network. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., neither disclose nor suggest "receiving, at the first of the plurality of user systems, from a second of plurality of user systems via the remote location, at each of the plurality of user systems connected to the network, second information identifying the said defined data segment within said recorded data segment located at said first user system connected to the network, said second information being data other than the recorded data segment and precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1of the present claimed invention.

The Office Action further asserts that the combination of the systems of Liwerant et al. and Moynihan would disclose the features of the present claimed invention. However, as discussed above, both Liwerant et al. and Moynihan are not concerned with sending **only** the first information identifying the recorded data segment to a remote location. Rather, both Liwerant et al. and Moynihan are concerned with sending the data segment itself to the remote location. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination, similarly to the individual systems of Liwerant et al. and Moynihan, neither discloses nor suggests "receiving, at the first of the plurality of user systems, from a second of plurality of user

systems via the remote location, at each of the plurality of user systems connected to the network, second information identifying the said defined data segment within said recorded data segment located at said first user system connected to the network, said second information being data other than the recorded data segment and precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1of the present claimed invention.

Additionally, as discussed above, both Liwerant et al. and Moynihan are not concerned with receiving, from, at a second location, information to identifying portions of interest within the video recorded at the first location. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination, similarly to the individual systems of Liwerant et al. and Moynihan, neither discloses nor suggests "receiving, at the first of the plurality of user systems, from a second of plurality of user systems via the remote location, at each of the plurality of user systems connected to the network, second information identifying the said defined data segment within said recorded data segment located at said first user system connected to the network, said second information being data other than the recorded data segment and precluding the transmission of said recorded data" as recited in claim 1of the present claimed invention.

As claims 9 and 14 include features similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, all the arguments also apply to these claims. As claims 7, 12 and 18 are dependent on independent claims 1, 9 and 14, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that they are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to claims 1, 9 and 14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Liwerant et al. and Moynihan, when taken alone or in combination, showing the above discussed features. It is further submitted that claims 7, 12 and 18 are patentable over Liwerant et al. and Moynihan, when taken alone or in combination. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that the all arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Barry Jay Weber

By:_____
Jack Schwartz
Reg. No. 34,721
Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing, LLC.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
March 22, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: March 22, 2007